

Lacanian Subversion: Psychoanalysis for the Post-Humanity Era

Rodrigo Gonsalves
and Ivan Estêvão

Abstract: The present article explores the triad theory-practice-political for psychoanalysis portraying contradictions, missusages and paradoxes, which derive from it. The discussion of the political as a feature embedded within the field is articulated and problematized. Through the Lacanian notion of subversion, this essay examines Lacan's position on May '68 and metapsychological implications for the field of such discussion. Focusing on what a psychoanalysis for the post-humanity era would look like, this critical appreciation of the political and Lacanian subversiveness, tensions the ethical of the field itself.

Keywords: subversion, Lacan, Freud, genericity, Žižek, psychoanalysis, communism

Psychoanalysis and its knots:

The construction of psychoanalysis as a field has always faced many challenges and most of these challenges seem to be structurally embedded in its core. One can easily find questions of science, practice, dissemination, methodology, boundaries (or its lack of)... So, it is not such a bold statement to say that psychoanalysis was forged through struggles. In this sense, it should come as no surprise or provoke awe into no one, address the divisiveness of psychoanalysis. The polemic history of the psychoanalytic field concerning politics or even, about the problematic tacit internalization of the political through the institutional aspect on the construction of the field - those are challenging elements since Freud started formalizing the field. Therefore, none of these remarks are necessarily new, it is actually quite the opposite, they were always already invisibly and silently making themselves present. Freud,¹ establishment of psychoanalysis as a field has always stumbled upon challenges regarding the triad of the theoretical, clinical and political.

This is one of the many heritages Freud left to psychoanalysis, but this is a quite particular one, this is a ghostly heritage. This challenging triad lurks through the field and haunts any one who steps into it. And as good ghost stories usually goes, the moment of 'scare' comes when the unexpected comes to surface, even if only retroactively as a surprise - what appears was always already there, hidden in plain sight. Dolar² makes this point remarkably clear, Freud's lack of political positioning, marked the foundations of the psychoanalytic field with this absence.³ The 'ghostly' sightings produced by the knotting between these three notions,

.....
1 Freud 1989/2014

2 See Dolar 2008

3 Danto 2005, p. 63

or to put into other words, the proper effects of this lack of the political within psychoanalysis have only recently started to be seriously explored. Considering this premise, the present article attempts to examine some authors that have already dealt with this 'ghost' before and also, takes into consideration a few notions that derive from it. And, not 'setting the score' with the political history, will always lead to creating the ghosts that will haunt the fields of knowledge.

The French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan is quintessential for the proper examination of this challenging triad. Lacan⁴ provided a much needed attention to the political through his psychoanalytic developments, but still not a necessarily satisfying one, many questions are still left open. Although his investigation of Freud's psychoanalysis did provide great tools to further investigate this blindspot of the field, the psychoanalyst himself was a bit ambiguous on some of his political positions. And, after approximately forty years of Lacan's death, his theoretical developments still resonate lively within many different realms of thought, but to what concerns psychoanalysis - the ghost of the political seems to keeps on haunting the field. It is not so far fetched to consider that Lacan felt the effects of this ghostly blind spot on his own skin. One should only consider how Lacan's excommunication from the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) seems to exemplify, to a great extent, an effect of that. Lacan was theoretically and clinically courageous, but this institutional and political step was rather forced upon him. Maybe the creation of the Freudian School of Paris [*L'Ecole Freudienne de Paris* (EFP)] could be considered an institutional materialization of an impasse derived from this triad.

Lacan's return to Freud⁵ and the establishment of his own psychoanalytic thinking was divisive from its beginning. And aspects of this divisiveness will be approached throughout this article, not in a historically dedicated manner but in a specific theoretical way. Considering this, a few decisions were already made and translated here through the framework chose for this text. These decisions are the following: (1) a reflexion between philosophy and psychoanalysis is viable (but not without considering its consequences) and (2) the standpoint of Lacanian psychoanalysis is being investigated and not refused. Therefore, this article does not aim at delegitimize Lacanian psychoanalysis, but to specifically approach and explore it. The key element to be considered regarding our 'ghostly' triad is the Lacanian understanding of subversion and its divisive consequences.

.....
4 See Lacan 1998 & 1997

5 See Lacan 1966

Lacanian thought and the ghost of the political:

This first stop might be considered a bit of a common place, but it is a necessary one. For psychoanalysis, the articulation between other fields was somehow always already there. Freud from the beginning of his formalization had invited literature, science, philosophy, as well as other fields. Although concerned with invention, his approach to other fields of thought was rather strategic and focused on defending what psychoanalysis was not. Much like trying to explain what a circle is by defending that it is not a square. This particular Freudian heritage was immensely embraced by psychoanalysts, but its consequences are not always fully appropriated. Basically, it is common to notice psychoanalysis placing itself as a particular discursive position, finding itself quite comfortable as a field to examine and address all other realms of knowledge, but usually forgetting that other fields *could* provide crucial insights to psychoanalysis.

The second stop made here, regards how Lacan took Freud's invitation of articulating psychoanalysis with other fields and boosted into much larger potency. Lacanian psychoanalysis is remarkably concerned with providing proper metapsychological grounds⁶ to the field in order to better sustain the clinical practice. So, the approximations with other fields explored by Lacanian psychoanalysis was 'internally' provoked and therefore justified by clinical challenges and theoretical impasses. This approach logically generates internal consequences, but the external subsequences to this very own movement of approximation were usually not cross-checked. With that being said, one understands Lacan's "uncanny"⁷ formal approach to other fields, traces unfamiliar/familiar bridges, since these were always already there. Acting as if psychoanalysis could smoothly bridge between different fields, because blurries the lines between the internal and the external, as a paradoxical feature printed in its "dna" allowing it to come and go as it pleases. Although Lacan was worried with the internal impasses of psychoanalysis, formally speaking, this critical rigor could be formidably valid if further explored, specially by psychoanalysis. And once again, this is most definitely not a denial of Lacanian psychoanalysis in terms of the validity of its structure and practice - this is only the tensioning of some historical impasses of its theory regarding our current conditions.

Another crucial heritage concerning our discussion is the silence, the peculiar silence of the political within this triad (theory-practice-political). Kept hidden under broad daylight, this silent link of psychoanalysis, its political link, make itself present in many different situations - but far mostly for its absence, in its brutal silence, its lack.

.....
6 Lacan 1966, pp. 376, 684

7 Freud 2003

The political in psychoanalysis acts like an anamorphic element, it is simultaneously invisible and all-too-present at the same time. For instance, when theory and practice are "pushed against the wall", is the ideological shadowplay of its elements that quietly present itself. Sometimes the reasoning behind a few of the formal and theoretical choices done in psychoanalysis are vastly ideological. So, it is incontrovertible that the political should be regarded when discussing psychoanalysis - especially, because it is an open element at its very own kernel. Thus, the consequence of this open element at the center of psychoanalysis is one of the key points of decisiveness within Lacanian theory. And along with ideological decisions, there will be implications and consequences. Such elements must be considered when thinking the current psychoanalytic scene. This is where ideological implications appear more clearly or where this decisiveness more obviously arises. But this apparent decisiveness is still problematic, because it only tells half of the story. When Freud approach psychoanalysis to the a scientific *weltanschauung*⁸, a scientific like perspective towards disagreements and developments was defended. Disagreements in the theoretical field, even metapsychological ones, should be addressed theoretically within the field and not avoided politically/institutionally. The usual defense of psychoanalysis in order to keep up with its theoretical and practice orthodoxy is to use the weight of the institution, e.g. IPA *versus* Lacan,⁹ because the author propose to think the field beyond the institutionally programed agenda. This is why a critique of ideology seems rather necessary to address the field - psychoanalysis as a field should most definitely not place itself 'above' it or free from it, as some psychoanalysts would like to think.

From the Freudian formalization of psychoanalysis and then to Lacanian developments of the field, the political has always found a way to provoke the thinkers. Lacan did pushed psychoanalysis to have a more open dialogue with its own problematic political kernel, but this point is much more ambiguous than it seems. The French author was most definitely not a militant revolutionary, even less was Freud for that matter. Although their combined efforts in psychoanalysis, managed to built formidable tools to thought itself and also, to the critical analysis of social transformations. To a certain extent both thinkers dealt with the political scenario of their historical realities in their theoretical developments and both provided insights to the external political situations (e.g. Freud on the World War¹⁰ and Lacan¹¹ on May of 1968) but

.....
8 Freud 1989

9 Lacan 1998

10 Freud 2010 and Lacan 1997

11 Lacan 1997

still, their wits was not necessarily translated into the institutional level of their own field.¹²

Ideological choices produce deep implications. How one approaches Lacanian psychoanalysis (or any other theory for that matter) should be putted be understood through such axiom, in order to attest for the knowledge produced from it. Thus, choices within knowledge production matter and they must come from the object.¹³ And psychoanalysis, in this sense, works in the same way, in a non-totalizing sense. For instance, when Stavrakakis¹⁴ discusses if Lacan should be consider either a reformist or a revolutionary, forcing a dichotomic approach which induces a false discussion. On a previous article called *The dead master, the placed master: another shielding of orphanage*,¹⁵ a detailed examination on Lacan's rather ambiguous relationship to the political, takes a closer look at his position on May '68 and provides a valid critique to Stavrakakis' render on Lacan. The two main critical points from this article are: (1) by placing Lacan as an "a" or "b" kind of theorist the author misses out on the crucial dialectical aspect of his materialist theory: its notion of excess¹⁶ and (2) reading Lacan as either a reformist or a revolutionary, do not do justice to the paradoxical subtlety and potency of the Lacanian formulation of *subversion*. The term is addressed in nine different passages throughout his book¹⁷ and yet, the type of *investment* needed to support "the radical democratic ethics of the political"¹⁸ remains to the author as a question mark. Well, the *subversive* viability of seizing the means of symbolic production, is a much needed type of investment towards current class struggle, a much formidable insight for proper radical politics. No questions asked.

But, this is jumping ahead, one must go back to Lacan in order to present how his political position is much more ambiguous than some authors (and some psychoanalysts) would like to think.¹⁹ For example, when Lacan famously stated:

If you had had a bit of patience and if you really wanted our *Impromptus* to continue I would tell you that the revolutionary

.....
12 Danto 2005

13 Milner 1996

14 Stavrakakis 2007

15 Gonsalves & Estevão 2018

16 Milner 1996

17 Stavrakakis 2007

18 Ibid., p.282

19 Gonsalves & Estevão 2018

aspiration has only one possible way of ending, only one: always with the discourse of the Master, as experience has already shown. What you aspire to as revolutionaries is a Master. You shall have one!²⁰

At a first glance, one could read Lacan's interaction with the students, as some crude reactionary position or perhaps a proto-reformist approach. But remember ambiguity is key, here. Lacan's position was that the structures were walking the streets, when he place such statement there is a crucial psychoanalytic insight being placed at stake. By the way, after fifty years one could risk saying that its a political insight still hard to be listen. As further explain on another opportunity,²¹ psychoanalysis requires conditions for its existence and must struggle against what resists to its existence. So when Lacan, prescribes hysterization at the clinical and social level, what is at stake is the movement of alienation and separation. Of its capacity for instituting and displace a master.

In this sense Lacan's position regarding May '68²² seems more complex than what meets the eye and the same could be said about this political perspectives. Here, the psychoanalyst is much more of a pessimist. And pays attention to the discursive twists occurring right in front of him, when he "prophetically" (we can now retroactively defend this) proclaims such statement to the students. When Lacan approaches Marx on his Seminars, he was doing in the name of the political silent link and did leave this as a valid heritage to the field. As an effort to voice this silent link and provide grounds for psychoanalysis to think contemporary suffering, Lacan is aware of the implications of articulating symptoms through Marx and Freud. Thus, after Lacan and Althusser's explosion of Freudo-Marxism, psychoanalytic theory permitted itself through subversion to think critically about capital and also, emancipatory possibilities. Probably the reason why there are tons of texts produced in this direction after Lacan.²³ A lot of proper names such as Jacques Rancière, Slavoj Žižek, Alenka Zupančič, Mladen Dolar, Barbara Cassin, as well as others... which to certain extent embrace the subversive viability of psychoanalysis in order to provide a valid critique to the contradictions of our reality. Therefore, Lacanian psychoanalysis renders forms of sociability and politics, especially concerning his theory of discourses. And another suitable argumentation, comes from the Lacanians trying to make sense if Lacan was a conservative or not. A rather homologous line of questionings one find on Marxists, more

.....
20 Lacan 1997, p.362

21 Gonsalves & Estevão 2018.

22 Lacan 1997, p.362

23 Estevão & Gonsalves 2018

than necessarily on Marx himself. Lacan's subversiveness speaks for itself. When Lacanian psychoanalysis, sustains its subversive function despite all efforts to 'normalize' it or to try to turn it into another mastery discourse - this is what is at stake and what should be consider. The defense of he analytical discourse as subversive, and the defense for the conditions for that discourse to always continue to be subversive, is where psychoanalysis should find its militancy. And psychoanalysts a large missing piece of their praxis.²⁴

Orthodox psychoanalysis hits again when the choice to read Lacan only through the configuration of the five discourses he did formalize and that forgets that Lacan himself was open to the formalization of other ones, has an ideological push. Other discursive possibilities are viable, especially one that aims at emancipatory politics and subversive conditions to current contradictions. So, for those who defend psychoanalysis must not be political, these are not naive but ill intended. Perhaps even cynicals, sustaining through their choices to privilege a given reality instead of fully embracing the subversive element that lies at the core of psychoanalysis itself.

Miller and the political: silent choices

If taking sides is crucial for psychoanalysis, it is necessary noticing how it shapes different coordinates for Lacanians and moreover, if there is someone who truly understand this is Jacques Alain-Miller (later on addressed as JAM). Well, in a sense JAM had to face major institutional challenges inside psychoanalysis which are analogous to Jung's. And institutionally, with associations and schools, he did progressed the Lacanian dissemination worldwide. And theoretically, at a tremendously young age he wrote fundamental essays for psychoanalysis and later on held the responsibility of establishing Lacan's Seminars. But concerning our topic of choices and political repercussions, one must consider Pavón-Cuéllar's²⁵ critical take on the paradoxical position of Jacques Alain-Miller to "fight" neofascism while supporting neoliberalism. Although a more in-depth understanding on the heritage from *Cahiers pour l'Analyse* still needs to be formulated, a whole new article would be necessary to even start to address the recent rampage of Miller against his old fellows Badiou and Rancière. But is safe to say that, it traces back to the political spectrum of psychoanalysis and its implications. On one hand, one must not 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' considering meaningful articulations and dissemination from Miller to the field; but on another hand, the recent events do invoke much needed attention concerning the political within psychoanalysis. So, bringing one of

.....
24 Estevão & Gonsalves 2018

25 Pavón-Cuéllar 2017

Cuellar's prescription:

The surprising thing is that it was a psychoanalyst who refused to listen with the greatest attention to the symptomatic neofascist denunciation of neoliberal capitalism. Like most of his compatriots, JAM preferred to erase the symptom than to attack the disease. Instead of facing neoliberal capitalism and positioning itself as abstentionist or voter against Macron, JAM and millions of French, in fact, only tried to stifle the telling neofascist symptom by voting against Le Pen. And they succeeded: they took a painkiller, a sedative that will take away the neofascist discomfort for five years, but what will happen in 2022?²⁶

Well, neofascism and neoliberalism go more hand in hand, as effects of capitalism than are just mere 'stumbles' of such system. And Cuellar defends the point that JAM, as well as other psychoanalysts, did not fully capture what Lacan pointed out about Marx through '68 to '70:

to grasp quantitatively the object of desire, to surplus-enjoyment, through the calculation of surplus-value understood as surplus of the use value of labor over its exchange value. But Marx's calculation allowed him to approach the notion of surplus-enjoyment by isolating what can not be reduced to calculation, which goes beyond surplus-value, what is lost by the worker, as well as non-transferable, unexplored, unusable for the capitalist. This useless is what manifests itself in the generalized unhappiness in Marx's capitalism, as well as in the malaise of Freud's culture, and it is also in the name of what we can condemn the typically bourgeois ideological reduction of desire to the supreme principle of utility, as is manifested in JAM and Laurent.²⁷

Obviously, the point here is not to condemn a much necessary stand against neofascism, but to contextualize it and to problematize Miller's particular silence regarding other political situations. Thus, something of Milner's understanding of a Lacanian materialism seems necessary to criticize this much defended principle of utility embraced by JAM and other psychoanalysts. The servile obedience to the current Millerian politics, without critical consideration can only sustain the suffering produced by capitalism and its contradictions. And even further, such dissemination risks turning psychoanalysis itself into a kind of hermeneutics of the elites. Therefore, some ethico-political priorities are

.....
26 *ibid.* p. 1

27 *ibid.* p. 2

required for nowadays Lacanians. The JAM from the crucial problems of psychoanalysis and who questioned Lacan about the ethical statute of the unconscious instead of the Heideggerian ontic, is no more. Lacan's understanding of ethics for psychoanalysis and its metapsychological implications, should be heard under the subversive potency of the field - which is a political one, as well.

Clinical psychoanalysis must be able to assimilate contemporary suffering. And it is unlikely sustain psychoanalysis subversive potency in the era of "post-humanity"²⁸ without taking into consideration its political kernel. Beyond only aiming at the reach of psychoanalysis for those who suffer, psychoanalysis must be able to absorb and speak to popular suffering. A psychoanalysis which problematizes suffering whose expression itself is money. A psychoanalysis dialectically aware of subversion, understands that the capitalist discourse does not connect subjects to other subjects, but subjects to the objects of their libidinal enjoyment²⁹ and must be able to deal with suffering caused and expressed by it. The metapsychological insights derived from this parallax, still needs to be further explored and developed, but such coordinates are crucial for clinical psychoanalysis nowadays. Such perspective not only provides fundamental clinical insights, but also, allows for a valid analysis of the conjunctions and disjunctions regarding labor and militancy faced by political movements and social movements. A psychoanalysis that faces its political kernel, must confronts its impasses regarding the economy logics, providing steps for a political transformation about how the subjects spend their time. The notion of subversion allows a shift of realms, it makes room for the displacements of fields and also to the introduction of a void or of a completely different universality,³⁰ therefore setting the ground for the 'transcultural' link of common struggle between different communities .

Subversion in psychoanalysis

Lenin stated that "[i]t is precisely because Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine, but a living guide to action, that it was bound to reflect the astonishingly abrupt change in the conditions of social life". Lenin's approach to Marx can be parallel to Lacan's approach to the Freudian *weltanschauung* (roughly translated as world-view), in his classic,³¹ he sets a non-totalizing science to encompass the field. Many challenges derived from this

.....
28 Žižek 2018, p.103

29 Lacan 2007

30 Žižek 2014, p. 180

31 Freud 2014, p. 38

metapsychological configuration arise, on one hand a non-totalizing logic was sketched, on another hand, the ambiguity towards the political got structurally placed. These profound consequences are bound to Freud's choices when establishing psychoanalysis.

The non-totalizing *wissenschaft* of psychoanalysis proposed by Freud, when formalizing the tools to investigate the unconscious setted all sorts of troubles that resonates even today. Lacan's return to Freud had to deal with some of those choices and the ambiguity with the political, this more symptomatic formation also played its part. If psychoanalysis always had a privileged sit judge external political situation, it seems to always had struggle to deal with its own political issues. And Lacan tried to formalize his response through the notion of subversion as a living guide to action, acting as a constant reminder that psychoanalysis is not a "lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine".

Lacan's notion of this excess, from that which is never fully symbolically subsumed, therefore non totalizing, an insight that in some sense guides Milner's understanding of Lacan as a materialist. And Milner defends that the main characteristic of an authentic materialism resides on the fact that it is not totalizing, derived from a systematic need. Milner describes this feature as an incompleteness and through it, the author approaches Marx to Lacan defending a non-totalizing reading of both.³² Especially articulating how such materialism allows for thinking the objects, with only a few exceptions. And concerning science, the author explains that:

There is indeed a theory of science in Lacan. She is very thorough and not trivial. To restore coherence, one must first establish what it is not and start from the difference that separates Freud from Lacan. For there also exists in Freud a theory of science. It is quite summary, and if we ask why there is one, the answer is simple. It lies in what we agree to call Freud's scientism, and which is only an assent to the ideal of science. This ideal fully supports the vow that psychoanalysis is a science. I am saying *ideal of science*. It is in fact an ideal point - outer or infinitely distant - to which the straight lines of the plane tend and which at the same time belongs to all and never lies in them. It is not the *science-ideal*, which "incarnates" in a variable way the scientific ideal: strictly imaginary determination, demanded in order that representations are possible.³³

.....
32 Milner 1996, p.10

33 Ibid. p.30

Milner explains this metapsychological disjunction-conjunction between the ideal of science with the science ideal, conforming to the disjunction-conjunction of the Ideal of the I to the I-ideal.³⁴ And even further, the author defends that: "From this structural analogy we shall easily extract the effects of the mirage which operates the name science, they exist, must be dissipated, but science is not reduced to this."³⁵ So, Lacan sustains Freud's aphorisms regarding science as a technique, but differentiates himself in terms of the ideal of science for psychoanalysis. Milner concludes that searching for the conditions where psychoanalysis would be a science and to present a totalized constructed scientific model for psychoanalysis to follow are the two faces of the same false approach. And without an ideal of science nor a science-ideal for for psychoanalysis, the field "must find in itself the foundations of its principles and methods."³⁶ It is the element of analysis which became the ideal point as an epistemological and clinical coordinator, Lacan³⁷ even defends the notion of *praxis* to describe the Lacanian orientation of analysis. To build the ideal of analysis for science, from within psychoanalysis. Milner reminds that such movement inspired the marxists of the *Cahiers pour l'analyse*, to find within Marxism itself its coordinates for praxis.³⁸

Psychoanalysis viabilize its praxis by letting go of an external ideal for itself and aiming at a possibility from within. This line of thought could be articulated with Canguilhem's critique of normativity,³⁹ where he defends how life is always already present at any moment of subjectivization, therefore artificial gestures of cutting will never be without consequences. And in this sense, any attempt at fully boxing psychoanalysis to moral, biological or scientific normativities, will miss psychoanalysis itself. Thus, the discursivity of psychoanalysis must be subversive at its kernel. On a clinical level, subjectivization is rather crucial for psychoanalysis. It deals with the narcissistic fiction of the I, established by the Freudian disentanglement of the ideal of I and I-ideal, portraying subsequent qualities of neurotic suffering. Both fictions express the past and the future constantly experienced by the subject. And for Freud, the present provides a temporal subjective experience of lack, sustaining a possibility for shift the narcissistic coordinates. And Lacan picks up this instance, presenting the double inscription of this

.....
34 Ibid., p.50

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid., p.31

37 Lacan 1998, p.42

38 Milner 1996, p.31

39 Canguilhem 1978

the good old Marxian notion of communism not as an ideal, but as a movement which reacts to actual contradictions. To treat communism as an eternal Idea implies that the situation which generates it is no less eternal, that the antagonism to which communism reacts will always be here. From which it is only one step to a deconstructive reading of communism as a dream of presence, of abolishing all alienating representation; a dream which thrives on its own impossibility.⁴⁷

Always from the standpoint of the excluded, the need for communism comes as a movement of reaction to social contradictions. It means to demand the impossible, to put the contradictions sustained by reality in check and aims at enlarge reality transforming it. This is the living guide of action which tears up the zombified fabric of reality, that pushes it towards new universalities. Marx is the link between Mbembe and Žižek, and Badiou will basically tell us how. In Mbembe's *Critique of Black Reason*⁴⁸ the neocolonialist thinker, philosophically portrays the "*Becoming Black of the world*."⁴⁹ as the new condition of existence in our reality. This means that the neocolonial domination and exploitation is globally spreaded, a point already warned by Marx and Engels⁵⁰ and explored by Fisher,⁵¹ Badiou,⁵² Dolar,⁵³ as well as many other thinkers; the consequence of this vastly spreaded capitalism, is the need of a "bridge" between cultures and identities, gathered in a common struggle against a common condition of suffering. This is what *thinking in circulation* or *thinking-crossing*⁵⁴ means for Mbembe, the possibility of a link that transcends identitarianism in the name of a common struggle.

And finally, there is Badiou's understanding of the 'generic' linking through Marx, the previous arguments from Mbembe and Žižek. The French thinker argues that:

"...Marx gives the name 'generic humanity' to humanity in the movement of its self-emancipation, and that 'proletariat' - the name 'proletariat' - is the name of the possibility of generic humanity in

.....
47 Ibid., pp.87-88

48 Mbembe 2017

49 Ibid., p.5

50 Marx and Engels 2017

51 Fisher 2009

52 Badiou 2012

53 Dolar 2008

54 Mbembe 2017, p. 179

its affirmative form. 'Generic', for Marx, names the becoming of the universality of human being, and the historical function of the proletariat is to deliver us this generic form of the human being. So in Marx the political truth is situated on the side of genericity, and never on the side of particularity. Formally, it is a question of desire, creation or invention, and not a matter of law, necessity or conversation... So for Cohen - as well as for Marx - the pure universality of multiplicity, of sets, is not to be sought on the side of correct definition of clear description but on the side of nonconstructibility. The truth of sets is generic."⁵⁵

Thus, Badiou's comprehends that revolutionary desire lies within the realisation of generic humanity, which represents the end of the separation between law and desire, and claims for the "creative affirmation of humanity as such."⁵⁶ Defending the necessary creative engagement for seizing the means of the symbolic fabric of our reality, supporting the law of life, in order to create a new symbolic fiction. Perhaps, this is what a psychoanalysis in an era of 'post-humanity' should ethically pay attention to. In this sense, perhaps this is the parallel to be consider. This is where the current coordinates of suffering are displayed, and a field which focus on diminishing symptoms and a traversing of the fantasy, must be able to address it. The constant subversiveness of psychoanalysis guides the analysis by re-inventing the coordinates for the subject by the subject, towards a cure. While the constant movement within communism sustained by the local engagement, reacting against the contradictions of reality and demanding what is impossible, also subverts the given conditions in the name of a new Universality.

.....
55 Badiou 2015, p.53

56 Ibid., p.54

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Badiou, Alain 2015, *Philosophy for Militants*. London: Verso Books.
 ----- 2012, *Rebirth of History*. London: Verso Books.
 Canguilhem, Georges 1978. *On the Normal and the Pathological*. Heidelberg: Springer Netherlands.
 Danto, Elizabeth 2005, *Freud's free clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice, 1918–1938*, New York: Columbia University Press.
 Dolar, Mladen 2008, Freud and the Political in *Unbound*, v.4, n.15, 2008, pp.15-29.
 Estêvão, Ivan and Gonsalves, Rodrigo 2018. O mestre morto, o mestre posto: outro tamponamento da orfanidade (*The dead master, the placed master: another shielding of orphanage*) in *Revista IPUSP: Dossie Lacan* 1968.
 Fisher, Mark 2009, *Capitalist Realism: is there no alternative?* London: Zero Books.
 Freud, Sigmund 1989, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* in Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, p.342-370. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 ----- 2014, *New Introductory Lectures on PsychoAnalysis*. Eastford: Martino Fine Book
 ----- 2003, *The Uncanny*. London: Penguin Classics
 ----- 2010, *Why War? Albert Einstein's 1932 letter to Freud and Freud's response*. New York: Sequoia free press.
 Gonsalves, Rodrigo. 2016. Ethics and Monstrosity on Psychoanalysis. https://www.academia.edu/36358381/Rodrigo_Gonsalves_-_ETHICS_AND_MONSTROSITY_ON_PSYCHOANALYSIS Accessed 15 September 2018.
 ----- 2018, Interpassivity and the uncanny illusions of our daily lives. In Continental Thought & Theory. Vol. 2, Issue 1, June – *Interpassivity*:241-269. <https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10092/15480/CTT%20V2N1%2011%20Gonsalves.pdf?sequence=6>. Accessed 20 August 2018.
 Lacan, Jacques 1966, "Psychoanalysis and Its Teaching" in *Écrits*, pg. 376. Paris: Edition du Seuil.
 ----- 1966, "The Youth of Gide, or the Letter and Desire," *Écrits*, pg. 625 Paris: Edition du Seuil.
 ----- 1966. "The Subversion of the Subject and the Dialectic of Desire in the Freudian Unconscious," *Écrits*, pg. 684. Paris: Edition du Seuil.
 ----- 1991, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book III: The Psychoses 1955–1956*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 ----- 1997, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book VII: Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 ----- 1998, *The Seminar: Book XI. The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 ----- 2007, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis (Vol. Book XVII) (The Seminar of Jacques Lacan) (Bk. XVII)* London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 ----- 2016, *The Sinthome: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII*, New York: Polity.
 Lenin, Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism *Zvezda*, No. 2, December 28, 1910. Signed: *V. Ilyin*. Published according to *Zvezda* text. *Lenin Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, [1974], Moscow, Volume 17, pages 39-44.
 Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich 2017, *The Communist Manifest*. London: Cardiff Books.
 Mbembe, Achille 2017, *Critique of Black Reason*. Durham: Duke University Press.
 Milner, Jean-Claude 1996, *A obra clara (Lacan, a ciência, a filosofia) (L'Œuvre claire: Lacan, la Science, la philosophie: "L'Ordre philosophique" [1995]*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
 Pavón-Cuellar, David 2017, *Notas para una crítica de la política milleriana* (Notes to a critique of Millerian politics, not translated to English). In: <https://davidpavoncuellar.wordpress.com/2017/05/21/notas-para-una-critica-de-la-politica-milleriana/>
 Stavrakakis, Yannis 2007, *The Lacanian Left - Psychoanalysis, Theory, Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
 Žižek, Slavoj 2009, *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*. London: Verso Books.
 ----- 2009b, How to Begin from the the beginning in *New Left Review* 57, May-June.
 ----- 2007, *How to read Lacan*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
 2014, *Event: Philosophy in Transit*. London: Penguin Books.
 ----- 2016, *Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with the Neighbours: Against the Double Blackmail*. New York: Melville House Publishing.
 ----- 2018, *Like a thief in broad daylight*. London: Penguin.

C
R
I
S
I
S

&

C
R
I
T
I
Q
U
E

/

Volume 5 /
Issue 2